

Rec'd
MP
14

1 LATHAM & WATKINS LLP
Mark A. Flagel (Bar No. 110635)
2 Yury Kapgan (Bar No. 218366)
355 South Grand Avenue
3 Los Angeles, California 90071-1560
Telephone: (213) 485-1234
4 Facsimile: (213) 891-8763

FILED

2008 DEC 19 P 4:19

RICHARD W. WIEKING
CLERK
U.S. DISTRICT COURT
NO. DIST. OF CA. S. J.

5 LATHAM & WATKINS LLP
6 David A. Nelson, *pro hac vice* pending
Jennifer Bauer, *pro hac vice* pending
7 5800 Sears Tower
Chicago, IL 60606
8 Telephone: (312) 876-7700
Facsimile (312) 993-9767

E-filing

9
10 Attorneys for Plaintiff
Symantec Corporation

11
12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
13 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
14 SAN JOSE DIVISION

15 SYMANTEC CORPORATION,
16 a Delaware Corporation,

17 Plaintiff,

18 v.

19 CROSSROADS SYSTEMS, INC.
a Texas Corporation

20 Defendant.

C08 05687

Case No. _____

HRL

COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY
JUDGMENT

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

21
22
23 COMPLAINT

24 Plaintiff Symantec Corporation ("Symantec") hereby pleads the following claims
25 for Declaratory Judgment against Defendant Crossroads Systems, Inc. ("Crossroads"), and
26 alleges as follows:
27
28

LATHAM & WATKINS
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
LOS ANGELES
COMPLAINT FOR
DECLARATORY JUDGMENT

FAXED

ORIGINAL

PARTIES

1. Plaintiff Symantec is a Delaware Corporation with its principal place of business at 20330 Stevens Creek Boulevard, Cupertino, California 95014-2132.

2. On information and belief, Defendant Crossroads is a Texas Corporation with its principal place of business at 11000 MoPac Expressway, Austin, Texas, 78759.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

3. The Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action and the matter pleaded herein under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a) because the action arises under the Federal Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2201 *et seq.*, and the Patent Act of the United States, 35 U.S.C. § 1, *et seq.*

4. Venue is proper in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2) in that a substantial part of the acts giving rise to the claim occurred in this District, and Crossroads is subject to personal jurisdiction in this District.

INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT

5. This action for a declaratory judgment of non-infringement and invalidity of patents is assigned on a district-wide basis under Civil L.R. 3-2(c).

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

6. This action involves U.S. Patent No. 5,941,972 ("the '972 patent") attached hereto as Exhibit A, U.S. Patent No. 6,425,035 ("the '035 patent"), attached hereto as Exhibit B, U.S. Patent No. 6,421,753 ("the '753 patent"), attached hereto as Exhibit C, U.S. Patent No. 6,763,419 ("the '419 patent"), attached hereto as Exhibit D, U.S. Patent No. 6,738,854 ("the '854 patent"), attached hereto as Exhibit E, U.S. Patent No. 6,789,152 ("the '152 patent"), attached hereto as Exhibit F, and U.S. Patent No. 7,051,147 ("the '147 patent"), attached hereto as Exhibit G (collectively "the patents-in-suit"). The '035, '753, '419, '854, '152 and '147 patents all claim priority to the '972 patent.

7. On August 26, 2004, Crossroads sent a letter to Veritas Software Corporation ("Veritas") offering Veritas a license to the '972 and '035 patents in exchange, in part, for "a

1 royalty rate as a percentage of the net sales of [Veritas] products covered by the '972 or '035
2 Patents."

3 8. Veritas requested Crossroads to provide Veritas with the basis for
4 Crossroads' assertions that any of the products or offerings of Veritas were covered by any
5 claims of the '972 and/or '035 patents. Crossroads indicated that it could not provide such
6 information to Veritas without a non-disclosure agreement in place. The parties discussed the
7 non-disclosure agreement for a short period, but did not ultimately reach such an agreement.
8 Veritas again requested Crossroads' basis for its claims. But the basis was never provided and
9 the parties had no further communication after the first quarter of 2005 until Crossroads suddenly
10 reappeared in December of 2008. In 2005, Symantec acquired Veritas.

11 9. On December 12, 2008, Crossroads sent a letter to Symantec offering a
12 license to the patents-in-suit for "any/all products, potentially including the various storage
13 foundation products acquired from Veritas" in exchange, in part, for "a running royalty on the
14 net sales of products using the patented access controls feature."

15 10. Upon information and belief, Crossroads contends that one or more of
16 Symantec's products infringe one or more claims of the patents-in-suit and that those claims are
17 valid, although it still has provided Symantec with no basis for such contentions.

18 11. Symantec denies that any of its products infringe any claim of the patents-in-
19 suit, and also denies that the patents-in-suit are valid.

20 **FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

21 **Declaratory Relief Regarding Non-Infringement**

22 12. Symantec incorporates herein the allegations of paragraphs 1-11.

23 13. An actual and justiciable controversy exists between Plaintiff Symantec and
24 Defendant Crossroads as to the non-infringement of the patents-in-suit, which is evidenced by
25 Crossroads' allegations that Veritas' products, later acquired by Symantec, as well as other
26 Symantec products infringe valid claims of the patents-in-suit, and Symantec's allegations
27 herein.
28

1 14. Pursuant to the Federal Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2201 *et seq.*,
2 Symantec requests the declaration of the Court that Symantec does not infringe and has not
3 infringed any claim of the patents-in-suit.

4 **SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

5 **Declaratory Relief Regarding Invalidity**

6 15. Symantec incorporates herein the allegations of paragraphs 1-11.

7 16. An actual and justiciable controversy exists between Plaintiff Symantec and
8 Defendant Crossroads as to the invalidity of the patents-in-suit, which is evidenced by
9 Crossroads' allegations that Veritas' products, later acquired by Symantec, as well as other
10 Symantec products infringe valid claims of the patents-in-suit, and Symantec's allegations
11 herein.

12 17. Pursuant to the Federal Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2201 *et seq.*,
13 Symantec requests the declaration of the Court that the patents-in-suit are invalid under the
14 Patent Act, 35 U.S.C. §§ 41 *et seq.*, including but not limited to sections 102, 103, and 112.

15 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

16 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff Symantec respectfully requests that the Court enter
17 declaratory judgment as follows:

18 1. That Symantec does not infringe and has not infringed, directly or indirectly,
19 any of the patents-in-suit;

20 2. That the patents-in-suit are invalid;

21 3. That Crossroads, and all persons acting on its behalf or in concert with it, be
22 permanently enjoined and restrained from charging, orally or in writing, that any of the patents-
23 in-suit is infringed by Symantec, directly or indirectly;

24 4. That Symantec be awarded its costs, expenses and reasonable attorney fees in
25 this action; and

26 5. That Symantec be awarded such other and further relief as the Court may deem
27 appropriate.

28

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff Symantec respectfully demands a jury trial in this action.

Dated: December 19, 2008

LATHAM & WATKINS LLP

By Mark A. Flagel
Mark A. Flagel
Attorneys for Plaintiff
SYMANTEC CORPORATION